

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application. Applicant amends claims 1-3 and 9-15 herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,348,971) in view of Aoki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,008) and further in view of Perry (U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,778). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,008) and Owa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,348,971), and further in view of Perry (U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,778). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant's traverse and solely in the interest of clarification, Applicant amends claims 1-3 and 9-15.

Amended claims 1, 2 and 10-15 now recite that the "intermediate output data" is "in a format which can be handled commonly by all the output devices". Similarly, claims 3 and 9 now recite that the "intermediate output data" is "in a format which can be handled commonly by all the network printers". As described at page 59, line 26 to page 60, line 2 of Applicant's specification as originally filed, if the network printer receives intermediate print data which contains printing conditions indicating that printing should be done on the network printer itself, it converts the received intermediate print data into specialized print data and does printing based on the resulting specialized print data. As described at page 48, lines 20-25 (the description of

step S102), the specialized print data is in a print format which can be printed by devices of essentially the same type and the intermediate print data is in a print format which can be handled commonly by all the output devices or the network printer.

It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. Furthermore, when evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, all of the limitations must be considered and given weight. *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), MPEP § 2144.03. Here, the alleged combination (and Perry in particular) fails to disclose that the intermediate print data is in a print format which can be handled commonly by all the output devices or network printers.

Inasmuch as the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the combination of the prior art cannot render claims 1-3 and 9-15 unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 4-8 depend from claim 3 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 3, 2008

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/  
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/pvd]